

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/800,130	KOBAYASHI, YOSHIHIRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John E. Chapman	2856	

All Participants:

(1) John E. Chapman.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(2) G. Gregory Schivley.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 September 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic

Video Conference

Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

1, 2, 9 and 11

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Amend claim 1 to more precisely define the invention claimed, in particular, to make clear that a divided output signal is input to the phase comparator. Amend claim 2 to make clear that the output of the frequency divider is input to the phase detector. Amend claim 9 to make clear that the mass of a substance in a liquid is determined. Cancel claim 11, since it does not appear to recite a structural limitation but rather is directed solely to an intended use.